

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

5 Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722).

Response:

Claims 1 and 7

10 As stated in paragraphs [0001] and [0009], Haraburda teaches a method and system for electronic tracking of packaging corresponding to a product in a package on a production line. Additionally, as disclosed in paragraph [0004], “ Upon completion of production, the end product is typically packaged...,” the object to be packaged is the end product finally manufactured on the production line. In other words, Haraburda therefore teaches a method
15 and system for handling the end production **after** the manufacturing process is completed.

Furthermore, Haraburda discloses using one of the computers to implement the method shown in Figs. 3A-3B, and accessing the **production history** stored in the database to perform tracking of packaging (paragraphs [0033] and [0034]). As a result, after the manufacturing process of the end product is completed, the database provides the production
20 history of the end product instead of the current status of the end product at the time when receiving a data request from the computer. That is, since the production history does not contain information of the latest status of the end product during a packaging process following the manufacturing process, Haraburda therefore fails to teach or suggest a method and system for **real-time query of the current status** (i.e., the latest status) of the end
25 product.

In addition, Haraburda also fails to teach or suggest performing electronic tracking of packaging corresponding to an **optical component**, implicitly or explicitly. That is, teachings

of Haraburda fail to anticipate the claimed optical component.

In light of above arguments, applicants assert that Haraburda fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 1 and 7, and believe that claims 1 and 7 have been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 7 is respectfully requested.

5

Claims 2 and 8

Haraburda does not disclose applying the electronic tracking of packaging to a mask used in a semiconductor process. Additionally, claims 2 and 8 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

10

Claims 3 and 9

Claims 3 and 9 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7 respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

15 **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

1. Claims 4, 6, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722)

Response:

20

Claims 4 and 10

Claims 4 and 10 have been amended to define that the GPS transmits position information of the mask when the mask is being delivered from a production line to a customer, which is fully supported by specification paragraph [Para 17]. No new matter is introduced. Consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

25

As stated above, Haraburda discloses a method and system for electronic tracking of packaging corresponding to an end product. However, according to Haraburda Figs. 3A-3B, no position information of the end product is required for packaging. In addition, the product

packaging process gains no benefit from the position information of the end product in the following product delivery process. In other words, applicants assert that there is no motivation to combine the GPS with teachings of Haraburda to anticipate features claimed in currently amended claims 4 and 10.

- 5 Additionally, claims 4 and 10 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

Claims 6 and 12

- 10 Claims 6 and 12 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

2. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haraburda et al. (US PG Pub 20020077722) in view of Rodriguez et al. (US PG Pub 20050114690).

15 Response:

- Rodriguez teaches scanning an RFID of an electronic device, transmitting the scanned RFID to a server, and then using an RFID database controller in the server searches an RFID database for identification details of the electronic device corresponding to the scanned RFID (paragraph [0047]). Rodriguez does not teach or suggesting transmitting the scanned RFID
20 information to the RFID database for updating the RFID database. Instead, the scanned RFID only serves as a searching index required by the RFID database controller for database searching. Additionally, Rodriguez also fails to teach or suggest using the RFID system to detect the position of the electronic device having an RFID chip. Therefore, applicants assert the claimed feature “utilizing the RFID system for detecting the chip to generate the
25 positional information and transmitting the positional information to the database” is neither taught nor suggested by Haraburda in view of Rodriguez. Additionally, claims 5 and 11 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

New Claims 13 & 14

Claims 13 and 14 are newly entered and contain limitations fully supported by specification paragraph [Para 15] ,”... Please note that the above-mentioned term ”real-time” means that if the MES 210 produces any new data, the new data will be immediately
5 transmitted from the MES 210 to the server 120 to update the information recorded in the database 130 that is stored in the server 120...”. No new matter is introduced. Consideration of the new claims 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

As stated in above arguments under Claims 1 and 7, Haraburda discloses referring to the **production history** stored in the database for performing tracking of packaging. If the
10 current manufacturing status of the product is updated by a new manufacturing status, the production history becomes incomplete, which is against Haraburda’s teachings. Therefore, Haraburda’s disclosure includes no description relevant to **updating** information stored in the database. Similarly, this claimed feature of updating the manufacturing status to maintain an up-to-date status record of the optical component is not anticipated by Rodriguez’s teachings.
15 In addition, new claims 13 and 14 are dependent upon claims 1 and 7, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 7 are found allowable.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/711,952
Amdt. dated December 15, 2006
Reply to Office action of September 18, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 12/15/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)